

PROFESSOR COCKERELL'S LECTURES
ON ARCHITECTURE.

In the sixth and concluding lecture on architecture delivered at the Royal Academy on Thursday, the 12th inst., Mr. Cockerell entered into some comparison of the classical and mediæval styles, and commented upon the imitative system of the present day. He urged the importance of studying the system of each style, in order to treat them effectively, and concluded with some general advice to the students on the principles of composition, and suggestions for the attainment of a distinct and national style.—He said, that he had now laid before them some outline of the various systems or schools of art; these studies they were themselves to carry much further than could be done in a short course of lectures. Originality would arise from the light, in which each individual would view the same subject. There were two errors, which must be carefully eschewed; the excessive love of novelty and originality, and of displaying originality, and on the other side, the exclusive desire for imitation. The first pernicious tendency had existed in Germany during the middle ages, and had been noticed by Albert Dürer. We found spires twisted, curved, and pierced, and every caprice in plan and arrangement. In the present day, we were wholly imitative, till at last we were becoming sick of reproduction. He said, that with this desire, we were apt to become partisans, and to believe that we really belonged to the times, in which the particular styles prevailed. Amongst the young especially, these erroneous notions were entertained. True, we did not, like the Germans, stalk about in long beards and caps, or as the French, adopt the Roman toga, and the costume of Francis I., but we had equal eccentricities, such as they were, amongst a people not very much gifted with the love of art. We should therefore endeavour to find what were the real sources of art.—He said, that art was the visible portraiture of the mind from which it emanated, the growth of the times and people from whom it sprang. We must confess, that it was amongst the Greeks, that art was best practised and understood. We found a practical use of the laws of optics in Grecian architecture, which no other system could exhibit. He then alluded to the *scamilli* of Vitruvius, the explanation of which had only lately been gained. It had been a tradition amongst bare builders, that unless the line of roof were *hog-backed*, it would appear to bend in the middle. Mr. Penrose had lately found, that the outline of the entasis, in the columns of the Parthenon, was the hyperbolic curve, and no other. In such merits the Gothic style was inferior. In construction, the principle of simple repose, perhaps rendered necessary from the frequency of earthquakes, was the only one followed, that of equipoise was not attempted. The Romans could appreciate the Grecian principles, and, though not equalling their teachers, did something that was still respectable. By the aid of the arch, they produced the magnificent ephebeum of the baths, which the architects of the middle ages knew not how to imitate. The ephebeum of the baths of Caracalla was wider than Westminster Abbey, and Westminster Hall would stand within the basilica of Trajan. These enormous vaults were of solid construction, and therefore there was no relying upon fire-offices and insurance. The professor here exhibited a view of the great ephebeum of Caracalla, restored. Did we turn to the architecture of the middle ages, he continued, we found no comic sections, and none of those refinements, which marked the smallest production of the Grecian chisel. In this comparison, we must be content to be losers.

The professor next alluded to the influence of climate and material, and to the trabeated and arcuated systems. He said, that these two systems should not be mixed together, and that we were apt to carry the trabeated arrangement into our churches, for which it was not adapted. The system of classical architecture turned upon the employment of the largest scantling, whilst that of the middle ages worked with such stuff as a man may carry on his back; what one effected by extension, the other produced by spiring up; in the one the main lines were horizontal, in the other vertical; the forms of one were designed to give shade, of the other to resist wet, and rather to tell by the outline on the sky than in

the eternal glitter of sunlight. In classical architecture the doors were of large size, the upper portion often serving for a window to light the edifice, in Gothic architecture they were purposely small. The windows, on the contrary, in classical architecture were small, and of minor importance, whilst in Gothic architecture, they were large and elaborately embellished.—He then said, that after the objections he had made to imitation, he might be asked to recommend a style, and therefore in church architecture he would offer some suggestions. These he could better express in the form of a parable. In this form the monk Colonna had composed his celebrated book, which had become a magazine of art, so much so that designs were carried out from the description.—In what followed, Mr. Cockerell pointed to a plan of a proposed cathedral, with accompanying buildings. Except in the circumstance of their being a spacious chancel, the principal building was in few respects similar to any existing cathedral, ancient or modern. The plan of that part intended for the congregation, was somewhat peculiar, being polygonal in its general outline, but broken by circular projections. Internally, the arrangement was octagonal. A chapter-house occupied the usual position of the lady chapel, and at the opposite end of the church was a large vestibule. These distinct portions were arranged in line, the main front being approached through a cloistered court. This plan, Mr. Cockerell said, he considered as a venture, and he had not attempted to draw out any elevation.

The professor commenced his relation by saying, that he conceived himself standing with a bird's eye view of a great city. Amongst the various buildings, one at once arrested his attention—it was the high church, built in the pointed style of architecture. To it were attached various buildings, the lines of which resolved themselves into great uniformity and symmetry, as though the whole had first appeared to be a confusion, and then resolved itself into a distinct symmetrical plan. The church was covered by a lofty dome, and by a smaller dome; there were also two towers, making in all four terminations. These passed each other, and were grouped in various positions, as they were approached in the windings of the road; he was reminded of the spires of Lichfield, as seen in driving round the city. The smaller dome gave a wonderful magnitude to the larger dome. The vertical lines, contrasted with the curved forms, and, together with the court-yard and the adjoining buildings, the whole shewed "a mighty maze, but not without a plan." The towers, similar in their construction, sometimes looked all solid, and sometimes perforated; they were like Antwerp, but were not bird-cages; the effect was that of the west towers of St. Paul's Cathedral. On a nearer approach he discovered, that the details were not Grecian, but of that cultivated Gothic, which the later ages permitted. The domes terminated in the ogee form, and rose from a base, round which there were projecting buttresses. In this dome, the eternal square and angle, which were the great reproach of mediæval architecture, were avoided. The small dome looked like a younger dome:—he was reminded of the Church of Sta. Maria della Salute, at Venice. He was also reminded of St. Mary's, at Oxford, there being buttresses and pinnacles clustering round, which seemed to give honour to one larger termination, that grew out of them. The covering was of tiles, in patterns—recalling the domes of Cairo; but although the ogee form was there, there was nothing Oriental. Such tiles had been used for roof coverings in Germany.

On nearing the west end, he found that it was approached by flights of steps, and through a quadrangular cloistered court; so that by going round, the church might be reached under cover. The cloisters communicated with schools, parochial offices, and other buildings. In these, the depressed or four-centred arch was always employed in depressed positions, as under floors, and the acute arch above, according to the principle of William of Wykeham. In the quadrangle, he noticed the admirable proportion of the plan to give effect to the west front. As Casarinius had recommended, the point of view was taken at 3½ times the height of the building. The western doors had three vast arches, similar to those of Amiens Cathedral. Around the principle door were grouped the

twelve apostles, rather larger than life, in ample niches, not elbowed, as usual in Gothic buildings, where you wondered how they got in, or how they could get out again, but allowing of the beautiful play of light and shade, which a larger niche admitted of. The doorway had the central pillar, against which was a figure of the Saviour. On the soffit of the arch was carved the root of Jesse. The doors, themselves of bronze, were covered with foliage, and subjects illustrative of the ten commandments; much importance being given to the ninth commandment. The figures of the apostles were so arranged in reference to other adjuncts, that a scale was given to them, as in the case of the sculptures of the Parthenon by the metopes. These figures, not being colossal, that modern mistake was avoided, which sees no other way of representing a great man than by making the man great. In their expression, he was struck by their sincerity and truth; they seemed, as if he had seen them before. There was great variety, and the character of each apostle was given. They were not dressed, as Bernini would have represented them, in draperies of silk, neither were they tattered like beggars, but in all respects their dresses were such as would be worn by labourers worthy of their hire. Near the same place were the patriarchs, the martyrs, Paul and Stephen, and the great reformers, as Luther and Melancthon. We might also observe the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, but no saint or miracle was represented in any part of the building.

On entering the church, he at once saw that it was a Protestant building, and not intended for processions. The first compartment was a vestibule, with pillars on each side. It was lighted by large windows, filled with stained glass, and was decorated in polychromy, the colours, in each case, being so selected as to harmonize with each other. The pillars were long and delicate, and at first there was some fear that they were not secure, but when it was discovered that they were bronze, the mind became reconciled. These pillars had capitals and bases of great projection. In the middle of the vestibule was a font, railed round. In the stained glass there was no quaint drawing, but the figures reminded him of those by Bassano and Titian, and he thought he could there discern the work of some, whom he would forbear to mention. The faults of the old stained glass were avoided; the light was not intercepted, the dark parts were not produced by black shades; the system resembled that in the windows at Munich, and was quite different to that of Sir Joshua Reynolds in the window at Oxford. The subjects represented included the sacraments, the baptism of John, with many moral subjects never before portrayed. This vestibule was used at burials, and for church meetings. The organ was placed at the west end. At right angles, between this vestibule and the church, there were galleries of access for valetudinarians.—On entering the church, he found that it was of large dimensions. It had a spacious chancel, the ceiling of the chapter-house being seen beyond the altar, somewhat after the manner of the Church of St. Giorgio, at Venice, by Palladio. The arrangement was that of the auditorium, required for Protestant uses, and to accommodate so large a congregation, galleries had been found indispensable. The floor of the church was lowered like the pit of a theatre, or as some of the better kind of meeting-houses. The communion-table was long, and fit for twelve, and behind it was an enriched screen. The great objection to many modern churches, arising from the size of the western gallery, was obviated, the architect having thrown up the centre portion for a singing gallery; thus there was an uninterrupted view of the church. The pulpit was attached to one of the piers. The ceiling was coved, and terminated in a ring of stone, near which were the heavenly choir, and groups of cherubim. At the top was a golden Triune. There were other star-like openings in this ceiling, through which light was admitted. Some of the galleries had latticed work, so that those, who went to church for other purposes than to show off new bonnets, could be free from observation. There was another gallery of stone similar to a triforium.—The general character of this building was English and Christian; yet it had not the square and angular outlines of the Gothic. It was evidently the work of no or-

dina
in a
been
of p
rang
and
holl
then
The
wer
T
arch
he l
been
don
mod
ord
don
sub
nat
Prc
and
Vic
the
the
the
por
th
wa
ap
ex
bir
on
re
we
H.
we
je
th
ch
re
we
li

o
b
d
e
h
t
t
l